

5-21-02

K's project  
was not only a  
F.MA

It was a rich  
FA, with possibility  
of catastrophe  
(a political calamity)  
— a gamble —

because it was  
a DPP, a K/T

gamble with catastrophe  
— to avoid an otherwise  
sure, s-to loss (calamity)

like esc. in SVN,  
each time

(lead done as a  
(consult, description)

FA - 20% - LBJ

July '65; TG;

RT

(like JFK in C-II;

FA, no consult.

with Congress, no prior  
attempts at coercion

(Hearings) - RISKY

More risky than  
immediate air strikes  
before <sup>any</sup> operations

To strike op. missile  
(that are not other  
centers to attack)  
is very risky,  
certainly causes  
major damage —  
(vs. 0 damage)

but the higher <sup>damage</sup>  
extent of attack

Costs:

amputation

(glorifying)

is no worse than

US occupation

Butter don't the

blue (white)

= ~~Greyer~~ Garbels

in C-II

Every party  
showed showiness,  
special info,  
reasonable code.

along with weakly,  
limited ideas,  
stupid premises,  
critical ignorance  
of world & our  
ignorant & unknown  
unknowns? — one of  
Russett's non-stupid  
notions.

There are "knows"  
that are wrong  
(a misunderstanding  
or inherent  
or uncertain)

X over

known  
unknown

Mark Twain: "It's what  
you know that is  
mistake..."

The  
Machines

The Harbor

Neither JFK nor K  
were noble  
men —

but they took  
big risks (beyond  
than they knew)  
because they were  
(secretly) <sup>such</sup> desperate

(without knowing the  
other one was, or  
why)

— by gambling  
they left "little more  
to lose" compared to what  
they were about to lose  
if they didn't gamble

(The other is sure  
s-t personal loss  
glamed brightly  
(hypothetically -  
obscure - how can  
I avoid it?)

compared to the  
chance (even, big-  
things around  
us) of a  
loss that would in  
other cases look (as it  
is) catastrophic.



convinced with  
a (the only)  
chance of coming  
out even or  
ahead, averting  
the loss is 5-61

C-II as K/T  
and DPP ✓

as well as F.M.A.

and gumballs  
(losing disproportionate,  
unpredictable, numbers  
- to observe

exp. to one not  
aware of the  
previous attitudes  
s-t some loss,  
or what it means  
to decide.

Challenger

Every RMA

Skylab!

Quemoy

BBP / French  
decide

SIN etc - events  
s-t loss - posthumous

Loss of prestige  
honor  
rights  
influence  
role  
allies  
leadership  
credibility

R actual as if  
Cred. (of conduct)  
is private channel  
even if no reputation  
(STOP) zero-sum,  
non-shared interests

as if he never  
received Trust  
of JFK

(Probing him to  
Max Miller)

(Who did Edwards  
see to?)

Abner/Rhodes  
(Who's there)

(A to Harry = No)

Hyp:

K committed to  
decisions  $\nabla F=K$  -  
but not to lie?

(Kongas did  
not lie - nor. Guly  
but the child lie  
the child lie

(+Dob? or not?  
but the lie to  
Dob? / +Gony?

6-1-12 midnight

Binkowski

Chickens - HK

(WWI fighter duels?

WWF? (Bauer)

Berlin: turtles } of JFK  
corn

But what of B/Berlin?

"miniscus: water

(super-cooled "

phase change

unstable

detonation: explosion

(m + C3)

(WWI "crises" (ref?)

WWII? processed  
(like WWI!)

of a series of  
crises that did  
not bring in war

[the day that did not  
come (when was it?)

(me + VN; Scott Hayden's  
joogie

(Robert: "noir"?)

May 27

Handing

invasion plus

Muzoon is

anxious?

prevention

1. Shwin - collab. on

C-4; give all of  
files

(Is there a bit of  
of Muzoon?)

March asst. for  
both of us? (Confusion)



Whether including  
(of threats)

a premise you  
hope not to carry  
out, hope you  
won't be called  
on to carry —  
that you'd have to  
be crazy to carry out —

So well-known you  
have to readily appear  
crazy (with suff.  
prob.) — Rank 5 14

Wf was the man  
credible (as N  
saw it)? (see list!)

Despite his experience  
& character, she could  
be crazy to say  
out there...

(real difference was  
the balance (penit))

not the  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 50  
personality.  $\frac{1}{2}$  + 2nd stg  
Cap -

From 1965-89  
RCU thinks the machine,

RPK  
If Cubans were to  
control MRBM's

more reason to  
agitate/attack

though much more  
dangerous, if attempted

---

\* ~~attack~~ blockade  
legal SU ship -  
passage ... !

(But SU obliged to  
esc USSR shipping) was  
imposed for US ability

to ~~draw~~ 80  
about us. US

Feasibility to draw  
80 of cap. us.  
Europe was  
not (quite)  
enough to make us  
give up Berlin...

(Other - of not  
recognize East Germany?  
if not we can?  
Berlin? 1

SCAN BOOKS <sup>9</sup> SEARCHABLE  
US? RINDLE? FOUND?

RFK/Kaplan

- difference between

private + public deal  
jump

RFK Ann on  
recusal for  
that

~~Ever since~~  
RFK/Holmes and VFR (+R)

1 Doc Oct 25

NEARLY  
unpublished on both sides  
on editorial comments

Oct 27 - "play" - ignore  
2d letter (Who?)

(BUT as kept. says, accompanying  
of jump (inc. B on net?)  
CBI DOVE COMMENTS

Centurion IRBMs

AVW against  
(late 1958!

(not for same  
reason as visits  
to Cuba!

not dangerous for us  
in 58 - because Bolivar  
was not dedicated for  
us...

4-26-12

Ad 5 analysis:

- fine ground of  
blowers

lumen (?)

snake, seat, ash

(cage)

subject

- 1944+ service for big  
air power - to have  
big R+D effort -

- A-bomb would  
thrust the  
(spont)

- but - to destroy  
SC - with A-bombs  
- and stop SC crisis  
(conclude :)

"Hind" large force

- ongoing, get large force -  
the, 2 groups with H-bombs  
[cos. from 15M to 300M]



("small" H. bombs -  
switchable for ICBMs  
(and MIRVs)

(and - from EU  
armies  
(+ East Europe!)  
area weapons

(still ignoring first-  
striking, to mutually  
"assured" weapons,  
planes (not, "bombers")  
on dual-platform

Of Mrs Thoms  
since 44 —

— Which have been  
justified in  
retrospect?

— accuracy

— effectiveness

— proportionate

— NO BETTER  
ALTERNATIVE?

— cancelling effects

of its end of threats  
holding & keeping

(e.g. effort and  
possibility of  
ending war,  
overriding D.M.,  
abolishing arms  
sanctions treaty)

---

Were any US threats  
justified?  
Europe? Berlin?

(Israel? Pak? <sup>N</sup>Korea?)